1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 5 6 7 JAMES R. MCDANIEL, JR., Plaintiff, 8 3:15-cv-00116-RCJ-WGC 9 VS. **ORDER** JAMES COX et al., 10 Defendants. 11 12 13 The Court dismissed the Second Amended Complaint upon screening under 28 U.S.C. 14 § 1915A, with leave to amend. When Plaintiff failed to timely amend as directed by the Court, 15 the Court dismissed the action without prejudice. Plaintiff later filed a Motion to Explain (ECF 16 No. 16), a Motion to Extend Time to File Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 17), a Third 17 Amended Complaint (ECF No. 18), a Motion to Add Page (ECF No. 19), a Notice of Appeal 18 (ECF No. 20), and a Motion to Respond to Appeal Documents (ECF No. 22). The Court of 19 Appeals has dismissed the appeal for failure to prosecute under Circuit Rule 42-1, and this Court 20 cannot countermand that ruling by reviving the action, even if it were inclined to reconsider. 21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 ///

CONCLUSION

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Extend Time to File Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 17) is DENIED, and the Motions (ECF Nos. 16, 19, 22) are DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 12th day of February, 2016.

ROPERT C. JONES United States District Judge